arXiv:1704.03775v1 [math.CO] 12 Apr 2017

THE HIGHEST ROOT COEFFICIENTS AND THE SECOND SMALLEST EXPONENT

TAN NHAT TRAN

Abstract. There are many different ways that the exponents of Weyl groups of irreducible root systems have been defined and put into practice. One of the most classical and algebraic definitions of the exponents is related to the eigenvalues of Coxeter elements. While the coefficients of the height root when expressed as a linear combination of simple roots are combinatorial objects in nature, there are several results asserting relations between these exponents and coefficients. This study was conducted to give a geometric proof of the fact that the second smallest exponent of the Weyl group is one plus the largest coefficient of the highest root except when the root system is of type G_2. Implications from the result may support the need for future research to further develop the understanding of the other exponents and coefficients.

1. Introduction

Assume that $V = \mathbb{R}^\ell$ with the standard inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$. Let us denote by Φ an irreducible crystallographic root system in V. Let Φ^+ be a set of positive roots. With the notation $\Delta = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\ell\}$, we have the simple root system of Φ with respect to Φ^+. Let $\theta := \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} c_{\alpha_s}\alpha_s$ be the highest root of Φ. We call c_{α_s} the *coefficient* at simple root α_s and α_s the simple root associated to c_{α_s}. Set $c_{\max} := \max\{c_{\alpha_s} \mid 1 \leq s \leq \ell\}$, the largest coefficient of the highest root θ. Let W be the Weyl group of Φ and let $m_1, \ldots, m_\ell$ with $m_1 \leq \ldots \leq m_\ell$ be the exponents of W.

The exponents of the Weyl group may have been originally defined in terms of the eigenvalues of Coxeter elements [Cox51]. In addition, they can be defined as the degrees of the basic polynomial invariants of the Weyl group [Che55]. The multiset of the exponents and its subsets also have led to many important results and applications in study of Weyl arrangements, which are examples of free arrangements ([OS83], [OST86], [OT92, Chapter 6]). All of these above-mentioned definitions and applications are purely algebraic. Shapiro (unpublished), Steinberg [Ste59], Kostant [Kos59], Macdonald [Mac72] and most recently also Abe-Barakat-Cuntz-Hoge-Terao [ABC$^+$16] have found and shown that there is another possibility to obtain the exponents, namely the dual partition of the height distribution of

Date: April 13, 2017.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 17B22 (Primary), 05A19 (Secondary).
Key words and phrases. Root system, highest root, Weyl group, exponent.

Φ^+. This latter approach not only gives a particularly simple way of determining the exponents in the individual cases but also reveals connections between the exponents and the other combinatorial objects of the root system. There are also many results in the literature stating relations between the exponents and the coefficients of the highest root of the corresponding root system. The most fundamental one is known that the largest exponent is equal to the sum of the highest root coefficients i.e. $m_\ell = \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} c_{\alpha_s}$. A complete description of the exponents in terms of $c_{\max}$ found by a case-by-case check is mentioned in [Bur09, Theorem 3.2]. What most interests us is the following interesting relation between $c_{\max}$ and m_2:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that* $\dim(V) \geq 2$. *Then* $c_{\max} = m_2 - 2$ *if* Φ *is of type* G_2, *for otherwise* $c_{\max} = m_2 - 1$.

The aim of this paper is to bring together combinatorial and geometric properties of root systems to provide a fairly elementary and geometric proof of Theorem 1.1. When $c_{\max} = 1$, the corresponding root system must be of type A_ℓ (Remark 3.10), which is the simplest root system in our study. We provide some results when $c_{\max} \geq 2$.

Denote by $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ the Dynkin graph and by $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi)$ the extended Dynkin graph of Φ. Set $c_{\min} := \min\{c_{\alpha_s} \mid 1 \leq s \leq \ell\}$. Let $\alpha_{\min}$ be a simple root associated to $c_{\min}$.

Corollary 1.2. $c_{\min} \in \{1, 2\}$. *Moreover, if* $c_{\max} \geq 2$ *then* $\alpha_{\min}$ *is always a terminal vertex of* $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$.

Corollary 1.3. *If* $c_{\max} \geq 2$, *there always exists a connected subgraph* $\Gamma := (\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k)$ *of* $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ *such that the coefficients* c_{γ_i} *at vertices* γ_i *satisfy the properties that* $c_{\gamma_0} = c_{\max}, c_{\gamma_k} = c_{\min}, c_{\gamma_i} = c_{\gamma_{i+1}} + 1$ *for* $0 \leq i \leq k-1$.

Corollary 1.4. *Assume that* $c_{\max} \geq 3$. *Suppose that* Φ *is simply-laced (in fact,* Φ *is of type* $E_{6,7,8}$*) and let* α_{rami} *be the unique ramification point of* $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$. *Denote by* $\Gamma_\lambda := (-\theta, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)$, $\Gamma_\gamma := (\gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_k)$, $\Gamma_\mu := (\mu_0, \ldots, \mu_p)$ *with* $\gamma_0 \equiv \mu_0 \equiv \lambda_q \equiv \alpha_{\text{rami}}$, *the branches of* $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi)$. *Then*

$$\frac{1}{c_{\max}} + \frac{1}{k+1} + \frac{1}{p+1} = \frac{1}{q+1} + \frac{1}{k+1} + \frac{1}{p+1} = 1. \tag{1.1}$$

The rest of this note is organized as follows. In §2 we review some definitions and preliminary results about root systems and Weyl groups. §3 is intended to motivate our investigation on some combinatorial and geometric properties of irreducible root systems. §4 contains the proofs of the main result and the corollaries.

2. Preliminaries

Our standard references for root systems and their Weyl groups are [Bou68] and [Hum72, Chapter III]. Let $V = \mathbb{R}^\ell$. Let Φ be an irreducible (crystallographic) root system spanning V with the standard inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$. The

rank of Φ, denoted by $\mathrm{rank}(\Phi)$, is defined to be $\dim(V)$. We fix a positive system Φ^+ of Φ. We write $\Delta := \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\ell\}$ for the simple system (base) of Φ with respect to Φ^+. For $\alpha = \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} d_s\alpha_s \in \Phi^+$, the *height* of α is defined by $\mathrm{ht}(\alpha) := \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} d_s$. We follow the notation used in [Bou68, Chapter VI, §4.4 -§4.13] for the explicit construction of irreducible root systems. There are four classical types: A_ℓ ($\ell \geq 1$), B_ℓ ($\ell \geq 2$), C_ℓ ($\ell \geq 3$), D_ℓ ($\ell \geq 4$) and five exceptional types: E_6, E_7, E_8, F_4, G_2. We write $\Phi = \Phi(\mathfrak{P})$ if the root system Φ is of type $\mathfrak{P}$, for otherwise we write $\Phi \neq \Phi(\mathfrak{P})$.

For $\alpha \in V, \beta \in V \setminus \{0\}$, denote $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle := \frac{2(\alpha,\beta)}{(\beta,\beta)}$. A *reflection* in V with respect to a nonzero vector $\alpha \in V$ is a mapping $s_\alpha : V \to V$ defined by $s_\alpha(x) := x - \langle x, \alpha \rangle \alpha$. The *Weyl group* $W := W(\Phi)$ of Φ is a group generated by the set $\{s_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$. An element of the form $c = s_{\alpha_1} \ldots s_{\alpha_\ell} \in W$ is called a *Coxeter element*. Since all Coxeter elements are conjugate [Bou68, Chapter V, §6.1, Proposition 1], they have the same order, characteristic polynomial and eigenvalues. The order $\mathrm{h} := \mathrm{h}(W)$ of Coxeter elements is called the *Coxeter number* of W. For a fixed Coxeter element $c \in W$, if its eigenvalues are of the form $\exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}m_1/\mathrm{h}), \ldots, \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}m_\ell/\mathrm{h})$ with $0 < m_1 \leq \ldots \leq m_\ell < \mathrm{h}$, then the integers $m_1, \ldots, m_\ell$ are called the *exponents* of W.

Theorem 2.1. *For any irreducible root system Φ of rank ℓ,*

(i) $m_j + m_{\ell+1-j} = \mathrm{h}$ *for* $1 \leq j \leq \ell$,
(ii) $1 = m_1 < m_2 \leq \ldots \leq m_{\ell-1} < m_\ell = \mathrm{h} - 1$,
(iii) $\mathrm{h} = \mathrm{ht}(\theta) + 1$, *where θ is the highest root.*

Proof. See [Bou68, Chapter V, §6.2 and Chapter VI, §1.11]. □

Let $\Theta^{(r)} \subseteq \Phi^+$ be the set consisting of positive roots of height r. The *height distribution* of Φ^+ is defined as a multiset of positive integers:

$$\{t_1, \ldots, t_r, \ldots, t_{\mathrm{h}-1}\},$$

where $t_r := \left|\Theta^{(r)}\right|$. The *dual partition* $\mathcal{DP}(\Phi^+)$ of the height distribution of Φ^+ is given by a multiset of nonnegative integers:

$$\mathcal{DP}(\Phi^+) := \{(0)^{\ell - t_1}, (1)^{t_1 - t_2}, \ldots, (\mathrm{h}-2)^{t_{\mathrm{h}-2} - t_{\mathrm{h}-3}}, (\mathrm{h}-1)^{t_{\mathrm{h}-1}}\},$$

where notation $(a)^b$ means the integer a appears exactly b times.

Theorem 2.2 ([Ste59], [Kos59], [Mac72], [ABC+16])**.** *The exponents of the Weyl group are given by $\mathcal{DP}(\Phi^+)$.*

We denote by $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ the Dynkin graph and by $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi)$ the extended Dynkin graph of Φ. A vertex of a graph is called a *terminal* vertex (resp., a *ramification point*) if it is adjacent to at most one other vertex (resp., to at least three other vertices). If two adjacent vertices of $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ are joined by a double (or triple) edge, we add an one-sided arrow which points toward the shorter root. The following result is the main key to prove Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.3.

(a) $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ *is a tree.*
(b) *No more than three edges (counting multiplicities) can originate at a given vertex of* $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$. *Thus* $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ *contains a triple edge only when* $\Phi = \Phi(G_2)$.

Proof. See [Hum72, Chapter III, 11.4, Theorem]. □

3. Some lemmas on positive roots

Lemma 3.1. *Any set of vectors lying strictly on one side of a hyperplane in* V *and forming pairwise obtuse angles must be linearly independent. In particular, if* $\Gamma := \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_q\} \subseteq \Phi^+$ *and* $(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) \leq 0$ *for all* $i \neq j$, *then* Γ *is a linearly independent set.*

Proof. See [Hum72, Chapter III, 10.1, Theorem′(3)]. □

Theorem 1.1 is easily verified if either $\operatorname{rank}(\Phi) = 1$ or $\Phi = \Phi(G_2)$ (triply-laced). Until further notice we assume that $\operatorname{rank}(\Phi) \geq 2$ and $\Phi \neq \Phi(G_2)$.

Proposition 3.2. *If* $\operatorname{rank}(\Phi) \geq 2$ *and* $\Phi \neq \Phi(G_2)$, *for any nonproportional roots* α, β, *we have*

(i) $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2\}$,
(ii) $(\alpha, \beta) \leq 0$ *if* $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$,
(iii) $\alpha - 2\beta \in \Phi$ *if and only if* $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = 2$.

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

We will use Proposition 3.2 to prove several important results that support the proof of Theorem 1.1. It is the main reason why we should treat the case $\Phi = \Phi(G_2)$ individually.

Recall that $\Theta^{(r)} = \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \mid \operatorname{ht}(\alpha) = r\}$. It is worth pointing out from Theorem 2.2 that $|\Theta^{(r)}| = 1$ if $m_{\ell-1} < r \leq m_\ell$.

Lemma 3.3. *For* $\beta \in \Phi^+, \alpha_1 \in \Delta$ *satisfying* $\langle \beta, \alpha_1 \rangle = 2$, *there exists* $\alpha_j \in \Delta \setminus \{\alpha_1\}$ *such that* $\beta - \alpha_1 - \alpha_j \in \Phi^+$. *In particular, if* $\operatorname{ht}(\beta) \geq m_{\ell-1} + 3$ *then* $\langle \beta, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 1$ *for all* $\alpha_i \in \Delta$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.2(iii), $\operatorname{ht}(\beta) \geq 3$. Thus $\beta - 2\alpha_1 \in \Phi^+$ and $\beta - \alpha_1 \in \Phi^+$. Suppose that $(\beta - \alpha_1, \alpha_j) \leq 0$ for all $\alpha_j \in \Delta \setminus \{\alpha_1\}$. By Proposition 3.2(ii), $(\beta - \alpha_1, \alpha_1) \leq 0$. By Lemma 3.1, $\{\beta - \alpha_1\} \cup \Delta$ is a linearly independent set, which is absurd. There exists $\alpha_j \in \Delta \setminus \{\alpha_1\}$ such that $(\beta - \alpha_1, \alpha_j) > 0$ hence $\beta - \alpha_1 - \alpha_j \in \Phi^+$. The second statement follows immediately. □

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose* $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \in \Phi$ *with* $\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 \in \Phi$ *and* $\beta_i + \beta_j \neq 0$ *for* $i \neq j$. *Then at least two of the three partial sums* $\beta_i + \beta_j$ *belong to* Φ.

Proof. See [LN04, §11, Lemma 11.10]. □

Set $\mathcal{U} := \{\theta_i \in \Phi^+ \mid \operatorname{ht}(\theta_i) > m_{\ell-1}\}$. Thus $|\mathcal{U}| = m_\ell - m_{\ell-1} = m_2 - 1$. Set $m := |\mathcal{U}|$, and suppose that the elements of $\mathcal{U}$ are numbered so that θ_1 denotes the highest root and $\operatorname{ht}(\theta_i) = \operatorname{ht}(\theta_{i+1}) + 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$. Set

$\xi_i := \theta_i - \theta_{i+1}$ and $\Xi := \{\xi_i \mid 1 \le i \le m-1\}$. Clearly, $\Xi \subseteq \Delta$. For $x \in V$, denote $\|x\| := \sqrt{(x,x)}$.

Corollary 3.5. *Suppose that $m \ge 3$. Then simple roots $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{m-2}$ all are non-ramification points of $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$. Moreover, $\|\theta_1\| = \ldots = \|\theta_{m-1}\| = \|\xi_1\| = \ldots = \|\xi_{m-2}\|$.*

Proof. Fix $\xi_i \in \Xi$, $1 \le i \le m-2$ and let α_k be an adjacent vertex to ξ_i on $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$. We have $(\xi_i + \alpha_k) + \theta_{i+1} - \alpha_k = \theta_i \in \Phi^+$. By Lemma 3.4, either $\theta_i + \alpha_k \in \Phi^+$ or $\theta_{i+1} - \alpha_k \in \Phi^+$. If $i = 1$ then $\alpha_k = \xi_2$. If $i > 1$ then $\alpha_k \in \{\xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+1}\}$. Thus ξ_i is not a ramification point. By Lemma 3.3, we must have $\langle \theta_1, \xi_1 \rangle = 1$. Thus $\|\theta_2\| = \|\xi_1\| = \|\theta_1\|$ i.e. θ_2, ξ_1 are long roots. One can prove inductively that $\langle \theta_i, \xi_i \rangle = 1$ and θ_i, ξ_i all are long roots for $1 \le i \le m-2$. Thus $\|\theta_1\| = \ldots = \|\theta_{m-1}\| = \|\xi_1\| = \ldots = \|\xi_{m-2}\|$. □

Lemma 3.6. *Elements of Ξ are mutually distinct. In addition, $\theta_i - \theta_j \in \Phi^+$ for $1 \le i < j \le m$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $\xi_i = \xi_j$ for some $1 \le i < j \le m-1$. Choose indexes i, j so that $j - i$ is minimal. By Lemma 3.3, $j > i+1$. If $j = i+2$, then $\theta_i = \theta_{i+3} + 2\xi_i + \xi_{i+1}$. We have $\langle \theta_{i+3}, \xi_i \rangle \ge -1$ and $\langle \xi_{i+1}, \xi_i \rangle \ge -1$ since ξ_i is long. Thus $\langle \theta_i, \xi_i \rangle \ge 2$, which is absurd. Then $j > i+2$ and $\{\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}\}, \{\xi_{i+1}, \xi_{i+2}\}, \ldots, \{\xi_{j-1}, \xi_j\}$ are connected subgraphs of $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$. By the choices of i, j, the simple roots $\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_{j-1}$ are mutually distinct, the condition $\xi_i = \xi_j$ implies that $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ contains a cycle. This contradiction proves the first statement. By [Bou68, Chapter VI, §1.6, Corollary 3(b)], $\theta_i - \theta_j = \xi_i + \xi_{i+1} + \ldots + \xi_{j-1} \in \Phi^+$. □

Corollary 3.7. *If $\beta, \delta \in \Phi^+$ and $\mathrm{ht}(\beta) > \mathrm{ht}(\delta) = m_{\ell-1}$, either $\beta - \delta \in \Phi^+$ or $\beta - \delta \in 2\Delta$. In particular, the subsystem $\Phi \cap span\{\beta, \delta\}$ is irreducible.*

Proof. Set $p := \mathrm{ht}(\beta) - \mathrm{ht}(\delta)$. Assume that $\Theta^{(m_{\ell-1}+1)} = \{\alpha\}$ and $\alpha_1 := \alpha - \delta \in \Delta$. To avoid triviality, assume $p \ge 2$. By Lemma 3.6, $\beta - \alpha \in \Phi^+$. Write $\beta = (\beta - \alpha) + \delta + \alpha_1$. On the contrary, suppose that $\beta - \delta \notin \Phi$, by Lemma 3.4, $\nu := \beta - \alpha_1 \in \Phi^+$. If $p = 2$, $\beta - \delta = 2\alpha_1 \in 2\Delta$. It remains to consider $p \ge 3$. Set $\mu := \nu - \alpha \in \Phi^+$. Write $\beta = \mu + \delta + 2\alpha_1$. Since $\beta - \delta \notin \Phi$, $\langle \mu, \alpha_1 \rangle \ge -1$. If $\langle \delta, \alpha_1 \rangle \ge -1$, then $\langle \beta, \alpha_1 \rangle = 2$, which is absurd by Lemma 3.3. Thus $\langle \delta, \alpha_1 \rangle = -2$ forcing $\omega := \delta + 2\alpha_1 \in \Phi^+$. If $p = 3$, then $\beta = \delta + 3\alpha_1$, which is absurd since $\Phi \ne \Phi(G_2)$. If $p \ge 4$, $\eta := \nu - \omega \in \Phi^+$. Write $\beta = \eta + \delta + 3\alpha_1$ hence $\langle \beta, \alpha_1 \rangle = 2$, a contradiction. □

Proposition 3.8. *(i)* $|\Xi| = m - 1 = m_2 - 2$.

(ii) If $\langle \theta_1, \xi_1 \rangle = 2$, then $\Xi = \{\xi_1\}$ and $m = 2$. If $\langle \theta_1, \xi_1 \rangle = 1$ and $m \ge 3$, then $(-\theta_1, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{m-2})$ is a simple chain and does not contain any ramification point of $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi)$.

Proof. (i) It follows directly from Lemma 3.6.

(ii) It follows from (the proof of) Corollary 3.5.

□

There is a geometric interpretation [MT11, Lemma B.27, Appendix B] that visualizes the highest root coefficients and gives their meaning. This interpretation was originally formulated and proved [Ste75, Lemma 1.5] for the version of coroots. Other related results can be found in [BC07, Proposition 2.1]. We provide here a detailed edition for the reader's convenience.

Proposition 3.9. *Let Φ be an irreducible root system. Suppose that $\Lambda := \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q\}$ is a subset of a fixed base $\Delta := \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_\ell\}$ of Φ of minimal cardinality $q \geq 1$ such that $c_{\max} = c_{\lambda_q}$ and $(\lambda_s, \lambda_{s+1}) < 0$ for $0 \leq s \leq q-1$, $\lambda_0 \equiv -\theta$, θ is the highest root.*

(i) If $c_{\max} = 1$, $|\Lambda| = 1$. If $c_{\max} \geq 2$, $c_{\lambda_s} = s+1$ for $1 \leq s \leq q$ and $|\Lambda| = c_{\max} - 1$.

(ii) If $\langle \theta, \lambda_1 \rangle = 2$, then $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1\}$ and $q = 1$. If $\langle \theta, \lambda_1 \rangle = 1$ and $q \geq 2$, then $(-\theta, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{q-1})$ is a simple chain and does not contain any ramification point of $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi)$.

(iii) If $c_{\max} \geq 3$, either $\langle \lambda_{q-1}, \lambda_q \rangle \neq -1$ or λ_q is the ramification point of $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$.

Proof. If $c_{\max} = 1$, obviously, $|\Lambda| = 1$. Now assume that $c_{\max} \geq 2$.

(3.1)

$$\begin{aligned} 2 = \langle \theta, \theta \rangle &= \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} c_{\lambda_s} \langle \lambda_s, \theta \rangle \geq c_{\lambda_1} \langle \lambda_1, \theta \rangle, \\ \langle \theta, \lambda_1 \rangle &= \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} c_{\lambda_s} \langle \lambda_s, \lambda_1 \rangle \leq 2c_{\lambda_1} + c_{\lambda_2} \langle \lambda_2, \lambda_1 \rangle, \\ 0 \leq \langle \theta, \lambda_j \rangle &\leq c_{\lambda_{j-1}} \langle \lambda_{j-1}, \lambda_j \rangle + 2c_{\lambda_j} + c_{\lambda_{j+1}} \langle \lambda_{j+1}, \lambda_j \rangle \quad (2 \leq j \leq q-1). \end{aligned}$$

We have used in several inequalities in (3.1) the following: $\langle x, x \rangle = 2$ for all $x \in V$, $\langle \theta, \lambda_s \rangle \geq 0$ for $2 \leq s \leq \ell$ and $\langle \lambda_i, \lambda_j \rangle \leq 0$ for $i \neq j$. By definition of Λ, $\langle \lambda_1, \theta \rangle = 1$, $\langle \lambda_{j-1}, \lambda_j \rangle \leq -1$ and $\langle \lambda_j, \lambda_{j-1} \rangle \leq -1$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 - c_{\lambda_1} &\geq 0, \\ 2c_{\lambda_1} - c_{\lambda_2} - \langle \theta, \lambda_1 \rangle &\geq 0, \\ -c_{\lambda_{j-1}} + 2c_{\lambda_j} - c_{\lambda_{j+1}} &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Note that $\langle \theta, \lambda_1 \rangle \neq 3$, which follows by a direct verification when $\Phi = \Phi(G_2)$. If $\langle \theta, \lambda_1 \rangle = 2$, then inequalities in (3.2) yield $2 \geq c_{\lambda_1} \geq \ldots \geq c_{\lambda_{q-1}} \geq c_{\lambda_q}$. By the minimality, $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1\}$ and $2 \geq c_{\lambda_1} \equiv c_{\max}$. On the other hand, $\theta - 2\lambda_1 \in \Phi^+$ hence $c_{\lambda_1} \geq 2$. Thus $c_{\max} = c_{\lambda_1} = 2$.
If $\langle \theta, \lambda_1 \rangle = 1$, adding up the inequalities in (3.2) yields $1 + c_{\lambda_{q-1}} \geq c_{\lambda_q}$. By the minimality, $1 + c_{\lambda_{q-1}} = c_{\lambda_q}$. Thus equality occurs here and also in each of the inequalities used above. We obtain a recurrence relation defined by $c_{\lambda_1} = 2$, $c_{\lambda_2} = 3$, $c_{\lambda_{j+1}} = 2c_{\lambda_j} - c_{\lambda_{j-1}}$ $(2 \leq j \leq q-1)$. Thus $c_{\lambda_s} = s+1$ for $1 \leq s \leq q$. Additionally, from $\langle \lambda_{j-1}, \lambda_j \rangle = \langle \lambda_j, \lambda_{j-1} \rangle = -1$ $(2 \leq j \leq q-1)$ and $\langle \theta, \lambda_1 \rangle = \langle \lambda_1, \theta \rangle = 1$, we get $\|\theta\| = \|\lambda_1\| = \ldots = \|\lambda_{q-1}\|$. Thus

$(-\theta, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{q-1})$ is a simple chain and does not contain any ramification point of $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi)$ when $q \geq 2$.
Assume that $c_{\max} \geq 3$, $\langle \lambda_{q-1}, \lambda_q \rangle = -1$ and λ_q is connected only to one vertex of $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ apart from λ_{q-1}, say λ_{q+1}. Thus λ_q is long and $\langle \lambda_{q+1}, \lambda_q \rangle = -1$. From $\langle \theta, \lambda_q \rangle = 0$, we get $c_{\lambda_{q+1}} = c_{\max} + 1$, which is absurd. Hence λ_q is the ramification point.

□

Remark 3.10. If $c_{\max} = 1$, $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ does not contain any multiple edge and hence does not contain any ramification point. Since $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ is a tree, it must be a simple chain [Bou68, Chapter IV, Appendix, Proposition 3]. Thus $-\theta$ is connected exactly to two (terminal) vertices of $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ on $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi)$. If $c_{\max} \geq 2$, by Proposition 3.9, $-\theta$ is connected only to one vertex of $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ on $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi)$.

4. Proof of the results

Proof of Theorem 1.1. If $c_{\max} = 1$, by Remark 3.10, $|\Xi| = 0$ i.e. $m_2 = 2$. Theorem 1.1 follows immediately. When $c_{\max} \geq 2$, Theorem 1.1 will be proved once we prove $\Xi = \Lambda$. By Remark 3.10, $\xi_1 \equiv \lambda_1$. If $\langle \theta_1, \lambda_1 \rangle = 2$, by Propositions 3.8(ii), 3.9(ii), $\Xi = \Lambda = \{\lambda_1\}$. We are reduced to consider $\langle \theta_1, \lambda_1 \rangle = 1$.
Firstly, we prove that $\Xi \subseteq \Lambda$. If $m = 2$, clearly, $\Xi = \{\xi_1\} \subseteq \Lambda$. Assume that $m \geq 3$. To prove $\Xi \subseteq \Lambda$, by Proposition 3.8(ii), it suffices to show that $c_{\xi_{m-1}} = \max\{c_{\xi_i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m-1\}$. Note that $\langle \xi_{m-1}, \xi_{m-2} \rangle = -1$ since ξ_{m-2} is a long root. From $\langle \theta_1, \theta_1 \rangle = 2, \langle \theta_1, \xi_1 \rangle = 1, \langle \theta_1, \xi_i \rangle = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq m-2$, we have

$$c_{\xi_1} = 2,\ c_{\xi_2} = 3,\ c_{\xi_{i+1}} = 2c_{\xi_i} - c_{\xi_{i-1}} \quad (2 \leq i \leq m-2).$$

We obtain $c_{\xi_i} = i + 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. Hence $c_{\xi_{m-1}} = \max\{c_{\xi_i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m-1\}$ as claimed.
Secondly, we prove that $\Xi \supseteq \Lambda$. By Proposition 3.9(ii), we have

$$\lambda_1 + \ldots + \lambda_s \in \Phi^+ \text{ and } (\theta_1, \lambda_1 + \ldots + \lambda_s) = (\theta_1, \lambda_1) > 0 \quad (1 \leq s \leq q).$$

Set $\eta_1 := \theta_1$, and for $2 \leq p \leq q+1$ set

$$\eta_p := \theta_1 - (\lambda_1 + \ldots + \lambda_{p-1}) \in \Phi^+, \text{ then } \eta_{p-1} = \eta_p + \lambda_{p-1}.$$

One can prove inductively that $\|\eta_1\| = \ldots = \|\eta_{q-1}\| = \|\eta_q\|$. Recall that $\Theta^{(r)} = \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \mid \mathrm{ht}(\alpha) = r\}$ and we claim that

$$\Theta^{(m_l - p + 1)} = \{\eta_p\} \text{ for } 1 \leq p \leq q+1.$$

It is clearly true when $1 \leq p \leq 2$. Suppose to the contrary that, we can choose the smallest p such that $3 \leq p \leq q+1$ and $|\Theta^{(m_l-p+1)}| > 1$. In particular, $m_{l-1} = m_l - p + 1$. Assume that $\{\eta_p, \eta_p'\} \subseteq \Theta^{(m_l-p+1)}$ with $\eta_p \neq \eta_p'$. There exists $\lambda_{p-1}' \in \Delta$ such that $\lambda_{p-1} \neq \lambda_{p-1}'$ and $\eta_{p-2} = \eta_p + \lambda_{p-1} + \lambda_{p-2} = \eta_p' + \lambda_{p-1}' + \lambda_{p-2}$. If $\lambda_{p-2} = \lambda_{p-1}'$, then $\langle \eta_{p-2}, \lambda_{p-2} \rangle = 2$, which is absurd since $\|\eta_{p-2}\| = \|\lambda_{p-2}\|$. If $\lambda_{p-2} \neq \lambda_{p-1}'$, by the minimality of p,

$\eta_p + \lambda_{p-2} \notin \Phi$ and $\eta'_p + \lambda_{p-2} \notin \Phi$. Hence by Lemma 3.4, $\lambda_{p-1} + \lambda_{p-2} \in \Phi^+$ and $\lambda'_{p-1} + \lambda_{p-2} \in \Phi^+$. If $p = 3$, we must have $c_{\max} = 2$. If not, $q \geq 2$ and λ_1 is connected to three different roots: $-\theta_1, \lambda_2, \lambda'_2$, which is absurd. However, if $c_{\max} = 2$ then $q = 1$, a contradiction since $p \leq q + 1$. Suppose henceforth that $p > 3$. Since λ_{p-2} is connected only to $\lambda_{p-3}, \lambda_{p-1}$, we must have $\lambda_{p-3} = \lambda'_{p-1}$. Thus $\eta_{p-3} = \eta'_p + 2\lambda_{p-3} + \lambda_{p-2}$, which is impossible since λ_{p-3} is long. This contradiction completes the proof of the claim. Therefore,

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda_{p-1} \mid 2 \leq p \leq q + 1\} = \{\eta_{p-1} - \eta_p \mid 2 \leq p \leq q + 1\} \subseteq \Xi.$$

□

To prove the corollaries, in addition to Theorem 2.3, we need more information about $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ as follows:

Theorem 4.1. *There are only four possible forms of $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$:*

(a) a simple chain,
(b) a graph with a double edge,
(c) a graph with a triple edge,
(d) a graph with a ramification point.

Proof. See [Hum72, Chapter III, 11.4, Theorem]. □

The corollaries are easily verified if either $\operatorname{rank}(\Phi) = 1$ or $\Phi = \Phi(G_2)$ or $c_{\max} = 1$. In the remainder of the paper, we assume that $\operatorname{rank}(\Phi) \geq 2$, $\Phi \neq \Phi(G_2)$ and $c_{\max} \geq 2$.

Proof of Corollary 1.2. The proof of the first statement is immediate. We denote by $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_k$ the adjacent vertices to $\alpha_{\min}$ on $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$. One has $0 \leq \langle \theta, \alpha_{\min} \rangle \leq 2c_{\min} - \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_{\eta_i}$. Thus $k \leq 2$. Suppose to the contrary that $\alpha_{\min}$ is not terminal then $k = 2$, $c_{\eta_1} = c_{\eta_2} = c_{\min}$ and $\langle \theta, \alpha_{\min} \rangle = 0$. There exists, say η_2, such that $(-\theta, \ldots, \alpha_{\min})$ is a subpath of $(-\theta, \ldots, \eta_2)$. Additionally, $\langle \theta, \eta_2 \rangle = 0$. We continue in this fashion to obtain two adjacent vertices $\mu_{j-1}, \mu_j \in \mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ so that μ_j is a terminal vertex, $(-\theta, \ldots, \mu_{j-1})$ is a subpath of $(-\theta, \ldots, \mu_j)$ and $c_{\mu_{j-1}} = c_{\mu_j} = c_{\min}$. From $\langle \theta, \mu_j \rangle = 0$, we have $\langle \mu_{j-1}, \mu_j \rangle = -2$. Thus $c_{\min} = 2$ and hence $c_{\max} \geq 3$. By Lemma 3.9(iii) and Theorem 4.1, we must have $\mu_{j-1} \equiv \lambda_{q-1}$, $\mu_j \equiv \lambda_q$. However, this is a contradiction because $c_{\lambda_{q-1}} < c_{\lambda_q}$. Thus $\alpha_{\min}$ is a terminal vertex.

□

Proof of Corollary 1.3. It is easily seen that Corollary 1.3 is proved if either $c_{\min} = 2$ or $c_{\max} = 2$. We are left with $c_{\max} \geq 3$ and $c_{\min} = 1$. Let $\Gamma := (\gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_k)$ be a connected subgraph of $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$ such that $(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}) < 0$ $(0 \leq i \leq k - 1)$, $\gamma_0 \equiv \lambda_q$, $\gamma_k \equiv \alpha_{\min}$. Since $c_{\min} = 1$, $\Gamma \neq \Lambda$. By Corollary 1.2, γ_k is a terminal vertex.
If $\langle \lambda_{q-1}, \lambda_q \rangle = -1$, by Lemma 3.9(iii), λ_q is the ramification point of $\mathcal{D}(\Phi)$. Hence by Theorem 4.1, Γ is the simple chain. From $\langle \theta, \gamma_i \rangle = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, we have

$$c_{\gamma_{i+1}} = 2c_{\gamma_i} - c_{\gamma_{i-1}}, 1 \leq i \leq k - 1, c_{\gamma_{k-1}} = 2c_{\gamma_k}, c_{\gamma_0} \equiv c_{\max}. \tag{4.1}$$

Therefore, $c_{\gamma_i} = (k+1-i)c_{\gamma_k}$. Subsequently, $c_{\gamma_k} = 1, c_{\gamma_i} = c_{\gamma_{i+1}} + 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq k-1$. Then Γ is a subgraph that we wanted to find.
Similar arguments apply to the case $\langle \lambda_{q-1}, \lambda_q \rangle = -2$ and we obtain

$$c_{\gamma_1} = 2, c_{\gamma_{i+1}} = 2c_{\gamma_i} - c_{\gamma_{i-1}}, 1 \leq i \leq k-1, c_{\gamma_{k-1}} = 2c_{\gamma_k}, c_{\gamma_0} \equiv c_{\max}. \tag{4.2}$$

Since $c_{\max} \geq 3$, $c_{\gamma_i} = 0$ for all $i \geq 3$. Thus $\Gamma = (\lambda_q, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, and $\mathcal{D}(\Phi) = \Gamma \cup \{\lambda_{q-1}\}$ with $c_{\lambda_{q-1}} = 2$, $c_{\lambda_q} = 3$, $c_{\gamma_1} = 2$, $c_{\gamma_2} = 1$. However, we eliminate this possibility since this graph whose the corresponding root system does not satisfy Theorem 2.2. □

Proof of Corollary 1.4. Analysis similar to that in (4.1) in **Proof of Corollary 1.3** shows that $c_{\gamma_i} = (k+1-i)c_{\gamma_k}$, $0 \leq i \leq k$ and $c_{\mu_j} = (p+1-j)c_{\mu_p}$, $0 \leq j \leq p$. From $\langle \theta, \lambda_q \rangle = 0$ we have $c_{\gamma_1} + c_{\mu_1} - c_{\max} = 1$. Thus

$$1 = kc_{\gamma_k} + pc_{\mu_p} - c_{\max} = c_{\max}\left(\frac{k}{k+1} + \frac{p}{p+1} - 1\right).$$

Since $c_{\max} = q+1$ (Proposition 3.9(i)), we get the desired equalities. □

Acknowledgements

This paper originates from the author's Master's thesis, written under the supervision of Professor Hiroaki Terao at the Hokkaido University. The author wishes to express his sincere thanks to Professor Terao for many stimulating conversations. The author also gratefully acknowledges the support of Master's scholarship program of the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) under grant number 142506.

References

[ABC+16] T. Abe, M. Barakat, M. Cuntz, T. Hoge, and H. Terao. The freeness of ideal subarrangements of Weyl arrangements. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 18:1339–1348, 2016.

[BC07] J. M. Burns and J. M. Clancy. Recurrence relations, Dynkin diagrams and Plücker formulae. *Glasgow Math. J.*, 49:53–59, 2007.

[Bou68] N. Bourbaki. *Groupes et Algèbres de Lie*. Chapitres 4,5 et 6, Hermann, Paris, 1968.

[Bur09] J. M. Burns. Exponents and highest root coefficients. *Commun. Algebra*, 37(11):3815–3819, 2009.

[Che55] C. Chevalley. Invariants of finite groups generated by reflections. *Amer. J. Math.*, 77:778–782, 1955.

[Cox51] H. S. M. Coxeter. The product of the generators of a finite group generated by reflections. *Duke Math. J.*, 18:765–782, 1951.

[Hum72] J. E. Humphreys. *Introduction to Lie Algebras and Representation Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 1972.

[Kos59] B. Kostant. The principal three-dimensional subgroup and the Betti numbers of a complex simple Lie group. *Amer. J. Math.*, 81:973–1032, 1959.

[LN04] O. Loos and E. Neher. *Locally Finite Root Systems*. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, 2004.

[Mac72] I. G. Macdonald. The Poincaré series of a Coxeter group. *Math. Ann.*, 199:161–174, 1972.

[MT11] G. Malle and D. Testerman. *Linear Algebraic Groups and Finite Groups of Lie Type*, volume 133. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 2011.

[OS83] P. Orlik and L. Solomon. Coxeter arrangements. *Proc. Symp. Pure Math., Amer. Math. Soc*, 40(2):269–292, 1983.

[OST86] P. Orlik, L. Solomon, and H. Terao. On Coxeter arrangements and the Coxeter number. *Adv. Studies in Pure Math.*, 8:461–77, 1986.

[OT92] P. Orlik and H. Terao. *Arrangements of hyperplanes*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 300, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

[Ste59] R. Steinberg. Finite reflection groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 91:493–504, 1959.

[Ste75] R. Steinberg. Torsion in reductive groups. *Adv. in Math.*, 15:63–92, 1975.

Department of Mathematics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan
E-mail address: trannhattan@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp